

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit 1644

Examiner P. Gambel

Atty. Dkt. P

0275836

1993-30-0089CP1C1

M#

Client Ref

Appln. Title:

METHOD FOR INDUCING ANTIGEN-SPECIFIC CELL TOLERANCE

Inventor(s): Randolph J. Noelle, et al.

Appln. No.: 09 164,568

Series Code ↑

Serial No. ↑

Filed: October 1, 1998

Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

**REPLY/AMENDMENT/LETTER**

Date: January 22, 2003

P. Gambel  
5/30/03

This is a reply/amendment/letter in the above-identified application and includes the herewith attachment of same date and subject which is incorporated herewith by reference and the signature below is treated as the signature to the attachment in absence of a signature thereto

**FEE REQUIREMENTS FOR CLAIMS AS AMENDED**

1. Small Entity claim	Claims remaining after amendment	Highest number previously paid for	Present Extra	Larger/Small Entity	Additional Fee	Fee Code
A. <input type="checkbox"/> NOT made						
B. <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn						
C. <input type="checkbox"/> made herewith						
D. <input type="checkbox"/> made previously						
For B & C See Required Separate Paper (Pat-256)						
2. Total Effective Claims		**minus 0 0		x \$18/\$9 =	+ \$0	103/203
3. Independent Claims		***minus 0 0		x \$84/\$42 =	+ \$0	102/202
4. If amendment enters proper multiple dependent claim(s) into this application for first time (leave blank if this is a reissue application).				add	+ \$280/\$140 =	+ \$0 104/204
5. Original due Date: October 22, 2002		<input type="checkbox"/> NONE				
6. Petition is hereby made to extend the original due date to cover the date this response is filed for which the requisite fee is attached		(1 mo)	\$110/\$55 =	+ \$0		115/215
		(2 mos)	\$410/\$205 =			116/216
		(3 mos)	\$930/\$465 =			117/217
		(4 mos)	\$1,450/\$725 =			118/218
		(5 mos)	\$1,970/\$985 =			128/228
7. Enter any previous extension fee paid since above original due date and subtract				- \$0		
8.				Extension Fee	+ \$0	
9. If Terminal Disclaimer attached, add Rule 20(d) official fee				+ \$110/\$55	+ \$0	148/248
10. If IDS attached requires Official Fee under Rule 97 (c), add				+ \$180	+ \$0	126
or if Rule 97(d) Request add				+ \$180	+ \$0	126
11. After-Final Request Fee per rules 129(a) and 17(r)				+ \$750/370	+ \$0	146/246
12. No. of additional inventions for examination per Rule 129(b)				x \$750/375 ea	+ \$0	149/249
13. Request for Continued Examination (RCE)				+ \$750/375	+ \$0	1179/1279
14. Petition fee for					+ \$0	
TOTAL FEE =					\$	
PLEASE CHARGE OUR DEP. ACCT						

15

16. \*If the entry in this space is less than entry in next space, the "Present Extra" result is "0"

17. \*\*If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 20, write "20" in this space

18. \*\*\*If the "Highest number previously paid for" in this space is less than 3, write "3" in this space

Our Deposit Account No. 03-3975)

(Our Order No. 037003 0275836

C#

M#

**CHARGE STATEMENT:** The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee specifically authorized hereafter, or any missing or insufficient fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith or concerning any paper filed hereafter, and which may be required under Rules 16-18 (missing or insufficiencies only) now or hereafter relative to this application and the resulting Official Document under Rule 20, or credit any overpayment, to our Accounting/Order Nos. shown above, for which purpose a duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.

This CHARGE STATEMENT does not authorize charge of the issue fee until/unless an issue fee transmittal sheet is filed.

Query: Is appeal deadline now? If so, file Notice of Appeals separately.

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP  
Intellectual Property Group

By Atty: Robin L. Teskin

Sig.

Reg. No. 35,030

Fax: (703) 905-2500

Tel: (703) 905-2200

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, VA 22102

Tel. (703) 905-2000

Atty/Sec: RLT/DJM

NOTE: File this cover sheet in duplicate with PTO receipt (PAT-103A) and attachments

Document#

PAT-120 5/02

# RECEIPT FROM PTO FOR INDICATED ITEMS

(Do NOT Use for New or Continuing Applications of Any Kind)  
 Use 2 postcards for all New Appins. (cont/Div/CIP, too)  
 Use this sheet when filing CPA

# OFFICIAL

put up Gm 9/2

5/2/03

Appin No 09/164,568	Atty Robin L. Teskin/djmoten
First Inventor: Noelle, et al.	Date: January 22, 2003
	Matter No: 0275836
	Client No: 037003

## ENCLOSED:

☒ Response/Amendment ☐ Appendix ☐ Cover Sheet ☐ Cited/Listed Documents

☐ Completion Request for R 53(f)/PCT Nat.

# No. of Pages Abstract

# No. of Pages Spec and Claims

# No. of Numbered Claims Only

# No. of Sheets of Drawings (Figs )

☐ 1 Set Formal ☐ 1 Set Informal ☐ Cover Letter

☐ Declaration ☐ # of pages

☐ Assignment ☐ Cover Sheet

☐ Small Entity Declaration

☐ Extension Petition (PAT-111)

# ☐ No. of Priority Documents

☐ IDS Letter ☐ Cited Appln(s) ☐ Foreign Sch Rep/OA

☐ PTO-1449 ☐ Cited Documents

☐ Issue Fee Transmittal Form PTOL-85(b) in duplicate

\$  Amount Requested be Charged to our Dep. Acct. No. 03-3975

OTHER.

Current DUE DATE:

January 22, 2003

(Submit Single Copy Only)

#20  
Goigou

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION OF

Randolph J. Noelle et al.

Application Serial No 09/164,568

Filed: October 1, 1998

Title: METHOD FOR INDUCING ANTIGEN-SPECIFIC T CELL TOLERANCE

Group Art Unit: 1644

Examiner: Phillip Gambel

OFFICIAL

Phillip Gambel  
5/30/03\* \* \* \* \*  
REPLY PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.111 ✓Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir

In response to the Office Action [Non-Final Rejection] dated October 22, 2002, applicants submit the following arguments. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

REMARKSStatus Summary

Claims 54-56 and 58-63 are pending in the application and have been examined. Claims 54-56 and 58-63 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Lederman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,403,091) or Armitage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,951) or Aruffo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,376,459) in view of Beschornier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,597,563), Cobbold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,690,933) and Eynon et al. (1992) *J Exp Med* 175:131-138. Applicants traverse this rejection based on the arguments set forth below.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 54-56 and 58-63 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Lederman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,403,091) or Armitage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,951) or Aruffo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,376,459) in view of Beschornier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,597,563), Cobbold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,690,933) and Eynon et al. (1992) *J Exp Med* 175:131-138. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.